

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on August 12, 2005, has been received and its contents carefully considered. Reconsideration of the final rejections presented therein is requested for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner's Action has rejected claims 7 and 8 as being obvious over *Blackwelder et al.* (USP 4,932,612) in view of *Ledwinka et al.* (USP 1,851,194). It is submitted that these claims are *prima facie* patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Applicant's independent claim 1 is directed to an aircraft which includes, *inter alia*, an airframe which has a corrugated area disposed at a ventral thereof. Moreover, a wing is connected to the airframe. The wing has an uneven friction area on an underside surface thereof. Also as recited within this claim, both the ventral envelopes and the friction area of the wing have fireproof and anti-wear layers.

As disclosed by Applicant's specification, by providing the uneven friction area on the underside surface of the wings, the friction factor can be increased, thereby increasing the lift on the wing. This is because the air flow occurring beneath the wing will be slowed down, causing an increase in pressure under the wing, to thereby increase the lift. This claimed invention is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

Blackwelder et al. disclose a method and apparatus for reducing skin friction. Initially, it is noted that the objective of this invention is opposite to

Applicant's claimed invention. That is, *Blackwelder et al.* is directed toward reducing skin friction, whereas Applicant's claimed uneven friction area is for increasing friction (see page 3 of Applicant's specification, for example). As such, *Blackwelder et al.* do not disclose or suggest reducing (or even changing) the skin friction under the wings 152 of the airplane 150. A careful reading of this reference reveals that the grooves are only disclosed as being formed on an upper surface of the wings. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would have had no motivation to have provided these grooves on the lower surface of the wings, since these grooves are utilized to reduce skin drag and friction. As such, if these grooves were formed on the lower surface of the wings, as required by Applicant's independent claim 7, then the lift on the aircraft would be reduced, jeopardizing its ability to fly.

Further, the Examiner's Action relies on the teaching of *Ledwinka et al.* However, this reference only discloses to a fuselage construction, and does not overcome the above-noted deficiencies of *Blackwelder et al.* That is, this reference likewise does not disclose or suggest a wing having an uneven friction area on an underside surface thereof, as recited by Applicant's independent claim 7. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's Action has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness against independent claim 7 and dependent claim 8, and it is therefore requested that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Such action and the passing of this case to issue are requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Should any fee be required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,



November 10, 2005
Date

Robert H. Berdo, Jr. – Registration No. 38,075
RABIN & BERDO, PC – Customer No. 23995
Facsimile: 202-408-0924; 202-408-5297
Telephone: 202-371-8976

RHB:vm

RESPONSE
Filed November 10, 2005

10/774,460